

those that the people feel strongly about and I would support the motion to indefinitely postpone.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Thank you. Senator Landis, then Senator Rupp.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I will vote against the kill motion and then strangely enough probably won't vote to advance the bill. Now, how do you explain such a contradictory or seemingly contradictory set of behaviors? Well, the kill motion I think says there isn't merit in what Senator Rupp suggests and that is where I think the kill motion goes wrong, that we not advance this bill this year at this time and seemingly slap the public in the face about its recent attempts to have a referendum on state laws is again I think appropriate, that is to say that we should forego raising the issue to a substantive conclusion this year and let these issues go without comment and without raising the question of whether or not we are going to have petitions in a greater percentage passed around than has been the case up till now. Senator Rupp asks us this question. Is 5 percent today the same as 5 percent in 1912? And the answer is, no, it is not. A hundred bucks isn't the same today as it was in 1912. The average diet isn't the same as it was in 1912. The road system isn't the same as in 1912. The educational system isn't the...nothing is the same as it was in 1912, practically. The amount of labor that we extracted to get a measure on the ballot was many times greater in 1912 than it is today and what has happened is we have diminished considerably through technology, through the urbanization of the state, we have diminished considerably the obligation of citizens and the effort necessary for citizens to put these issues on the ballot. It was tough to do in 1912, it should be tough to do today. To vote for the kill motion is to say we don't care that that has happened, the public should be given in essence a blank check and that we simply create a very small hoop for them to jump through if they are going to use this extra political process to get their wills enacted into law and it really undercuts the idea of deliberative lawmaking, collegial, deliberative lawmaking. So, in my point of view, the Abboud kill motion says the wrong thing. It endorses the notion that we make this process very, very easy to do and that is the wrong conclusion. To me, on the underlying substantive issue, we should make some attempt to find a fair and reasonable